



faith basis for removing her child to Mexico.<sup>2</sup> The Court disagrees with Posada for two reasons.


First, while Posada states awarding \$4,583.54 “would significantly impair her ability to care for the child,” Posada does not offer any further explanation or evidence as to why such an award would impair her ability to take care of the child. For example, would such an award impair Posada’s ability to pay rent? Would it impair her ability to provide the child with adequate food? Unfortunately, Posada’s lack of depth in her briefing means the Court cannot find that awarding the requested expenses would be “clearly inappropriate.”

Second, the Court cannot find that such an award is clearly inappropriate based on Posada’s good faith argument. During this lawsuit, evidence arose that Posada asked Garcia to sign the passport application for the child, and Garcia refused. Then Posada covertly took the child to the United States under the guise of taking him to the beach from October 9, 2023, to October 13, 2023. But instead of going to the beach, Posada fled to Texas with the child and texted Garcia the truth only once she had fled. On this record, the Court cannot find that a good faith basis for removal means an award of expenses is clearly inappropriate.

---

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 79.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 15th day of August, 2024.



---

BRANTLEY STARR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE